

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/15/2020 6:00:00 AM

First name: Ken

Last name: Rich

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Midas Gold Idaho has been a member of our community for the past decade. During this time, the company and its employees have become wonderful champions and supporters of our community. They've volunteered their time in our schools and given generously to community causes. The company's track record of following through on its promises and doing the right thing gives us the confidence to write in support of permitting the Stibnite Gold Project.

Reviewing the draft environmental impact statement, I believe Alternative 2 is the best choice for Idaho. Alternative 3 would have a larger project footprint, impact more wetlands based on functional units, impact more stream reaches and delay the benefits of the project by two years. Alternative 2 would have less impact on the environment. Alternative 4 is not a good choice because it would put traffic to site right next to the East Fork of the South Fork of the Salmon River. This puts waterways and fish at an unnecessary risk. Alternative 4 also would delay the project unnecessarily. Alternative 5 is not even a realistic option because it would leave the site in the same condition it is today.

Right now, fish are blocked from their native spawning grounds and arsenic and antimony are leaching into the ground and surface water. It is unconscionable to think we could leave the area in this state of repair. Alternative 2 would allow Midas Gold to provide critical minerals for the U.S. and clean up the site.

I understand some people are requesting additional time to comment. With the resources the Forest Service has put together, especially the virtual meeting room, 60 days is ample time to provide feedback on the DEIS.